Ira G. Greenberg (IG 6156)
Scott H. Casher (SC 7903)
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiff
750 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 308-4411

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SS&C TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Plaintiff, versus REUTERS AMERICA LLC, REUTERS LIMITED, and REUTERS AMERICA, INC., Defendants.	No. 06 Civ. 154 (NRB) REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIMS

FIRST DEFENSE

Plaintiff SS&C Technologies, Inc. replies to defendants' counterclaims as follows:

1. Cannot respond to paragraph 47 of the answer in that the answer does not contain paragraphs 1-134. On the assumption that the intended repleader is of paragraphs 30-34, 37-38, 40-42, and 44-45 of the answer, the responses are as annexed to this reply.

2. Denies the allegations of paragraphs 48-51 of the answer.

3. In response to paragraph 52 of the answer, realleges the applicable paragraphs of the complaint in reply to the repleader of paragraphs 1-27; does not

respond to paragraphs 28-29, 35-36, 39, 43, and 46-47, as no response is required; and realleges the answers to the remaining repleaded paragraphs.

4. Denies the allegations of paragraph 53 of the answer, except admits that defendants paid SS&C $111,559.10 after they had sent exhibit A to the answer.

5. Denies the allegations of paragraph 54 of the answer, except admits that SS&C accepted the payments and did not call to defendants' attention that they had made the payments.

6. Denies the allegations of paragraph 55 of the answer, except admits that defendants asked for the return of the $111,559.10 and that SS&C declined to return it.

7. Denies the allegations of paragraph 56 of the answer.

8. In response to paragraph 57 of the answer, realleges the applicable paragraphs of the complaint in reply to the repleader of paragraphs 1-27; does not respond to paragraphs 28-29, 35-36, 39, 43, 46-47, and 52 as no response is required; and realleges the answers to the remaining repleaded paragraphs.

9. Denies the allegations of paragraph 58 of the answer, except admits that defendants paid SS&C $111,559.10 after they had sent exhibit A to the answer.

10. Denies the allegations of paragraph 59 of the answer, except admits that SS&C accepted the payments and did not call to defendants' attention that they had made the payments.

11. Denies the allegations of paragraph 60 of the answer.

12. Admits the allegations of paragraph 61 of the answer.

13. Denies the allegations of paragraphs 62-63 of the answer.

SECOND DEFENSE

14. One or more counts of the answer fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff SS&C Technologies, Inc. demands judgment in its favor on the counterclaims, together with the costs and disbursements of their defense.

Dated: New York, NY
March 14, 2006

Ira G. Greenberg (IG 6156)
Scott H. Casher (SC 7903)
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiff
750 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 308-4411

TO:

Charles T. Spada, Esq.
Lauren C. Freundlich, Esq.
LANKLER SIFFERT & WOHL LLP
Attorneys for Defendants
500 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10010
(212) 921-8399

APPENDIX TO REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIMS

Plaintiff SS&C Technologies, Inc. responds to those allegations that are identified in paragraph 1 of the reply to the counterclaims as follows:

1. Denies the allegations of paragraph 30 of the answer, except admits that, pursuant to section 7.1 of the parties' agreement, the agreement automatically renews at the end of the term unless there is written notice of the election not to renew at least sixty days before a term's expiration.

2. Denies the allegations of paragraph 31 of the answer, except admits that SS&C received the letter annexed as exhibit A to the answer, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the date on which it was received and as to defendants' state of mind.

3. Denies the allegations of the first paragraph 32 of the answer.

4. Denies the allegations of the second paragraph 32 of the answer, except admits that SS&C received the letter annexed as exhibit A to the answer, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the date on which it was received and as to who signed the letter.

5. Denies the allegations of paragraph 33 of the answer, except admits that SS&C received payments from defendants, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the precise number of payments.

6. Denies the allegations of paragraph 34 of the answer, except admits that SS&C demanded payment pursuant to the contract.

7. Denies the allegations of paragraph 37 of the answer, except admits that defendants paid SS&C approximately $111,559.10.

8. Denies the allegations of paragraph 38 of the answer, except admits that all payments that defendants made should be credited against their obligations.

9. Denies the allegations of paragraph 40 the answer, except admits that SS&C received a copy of exhibit A to the answer, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the date on which it was received.

10. Denies the allegations of paragraphs 41-45 of the answer.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 14th day of March, 2006, I caused a true copy of the attached reply to be served on Lankler Siffert & Wohl, LLP, attorneys for defendant, by first-class mail.

IRA G. GREENBERG